

REMARKS

Claims 78 - 99 have been added. Claims 1 – 37 and 45 - 77 have been cancelled in this response, without prejudice. Claims 38-44 were cancelled in a previous response. Hence, Claims 78 - 99 are pending in the Application.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 101

Claims 36, 37, 39-70 are rejected under 35 USC 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. The rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of these claims.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 97

Claims 1 – 70 are rejected under 35 USC 97(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,890,0167 (hereinafter Bridge) in view of US Patent Application No 2004/0034615 (hereinafter Thoms). The rejection is moot in view of the claim cancellations.

NEW CLAIMS

Claims 78 – 99 have been added. Support for the new claims may be found in the specification at least in paragraphs 19-21, 46-56, and 61-69, as well as the original filed claims.

New Claim 78 recites:

A method comprising:

receiving, from a user, input that selects a plurality of database objects to be transported from a source database to a target database, wherein the plurality of database objects includes at least one of:
a view,

a sequence,
a dimension,
a cube,
an ETL mapping,
a queue,
an external table,
a stored procedure, or
a database object, wherein the metadata for the database object is
stored outside of the source database and the target
database;
reading metadata about each selected object to determine a manner in
which to transport the selected objects to the target database;
storing meta-metadata that indicates the manner in which to transport the
selected objects to the target database; and
based on the meta-metadata, performing operations to transport the
selected objects to the target database.

New Claim 78 is allowable over the cited art for at least the following reasons. Bridge may teach one mechanism for moving one type of database object. The mechanism taught by Bridge being a pluggable tablespace. The only type of objects that can be moved by the pluggable tablespace mechanism taught by Bridge are objects within the tablespace. However, that same mechanism cannot be used to move other types of objects. For example, the pluggable tablespace mechanism cannot transport a view. The reason the pluggable tablespace mechanism, as taught by Bridge, cannot transport a view is that a view may have dependencies on other views or may have dependencies a program, which must be taken into account for the transport to work properly. However, the pluggable tablespace mechanism taught by Bridge does not take these types of dependencies into account.

Claim 78, however, recites reading metadata about each selected object to determine a manner in which to transport the selected objects to the target database. Moreover, Claim 78 recites storing meta-metadata that indicates the manner in which to transport the selected objects.

New Claim 86 recites, in part:

reading metadata about each selected object to determine a manner in which to transport the selected objects to the target database;
storing meta-metadata that indicates the manner in which to transport the selected objects to the target database.

Therefore, New Claim 86 is allowable for reasons discussed in connection with new claim 78.

New Claim 94 recites, in part:

receiving, at a target database, meta-metadata that indicates a manner in which to transport selected objects from a source database to the target database;
based on the meta-metadata, performing operations to transport the selected objects to the target database.

For reasons discussed in connection with new claim 78, Claim 94 is allowable.

New dependent Claims 79, 87 and 95 recite:

in response to a failure occurring during the transport of any of the selected objects to the target database, rolling back all changes made during the transport of the selected objects to the target database.

Rolling back a database-to-database transport of user selected objects is not taught or suggested by any of the cited references.

The pending claims not discussed so far are dependant claims that depend on an independent claim that is discussed above. Because each of the dependant claims include the limitations of claims upon which they depend, the dependant claims are patentable for at least those reasons the claims upon which the dependant claims depend are patentable. Removal of the rejections with respect to the dependant claims and allowance of the dependant claims is respectfully requested. In addition, the dependent claims introduce additional limitations that independently render them patentable. Due to the fundamental difference already identified, a separate discussion of those limitations is not included at this time.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are patentable over the art of record, including the art cited but not applied. Accordingly, allowance of all claims is hereby respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: July 23, 2007

/RonaldMPomerence/

Ronald M. Pomerence

Reg. No. 43,009

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 544
San Jose, CA 95110
Telephone No.: (402) 408-1080 ext.210
Facsimile No.: (402) 408-1076

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION VIA EFS-WEB

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.8(a)(1)(ii), I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the United States Patent & Trademark Office via the Office electronic filing system in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §§1.6(1)(4) and 1.8(a)(1)(i)(C) on the date indicated below and before 9:00 PM PST.

Submission date: 7/23/2007 by /Trudy Bagdon/
Trudy Bagdon